arXiv:cond-mat/0204460v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 22 Apr 2002

STATIONARY THERMOMAGNETIC WAVES IN SUPERCONDUCTORS

N.A. Taylanov

Research Institute of Applied Physics,
National University of Uzbekistan,
Vuzgorodok, Tashkent, 700174, Uzbekistan

e-mail: taylanov@iaph.tkt.uz

Abstract

The propagation of a nonlinear stationary thermomagnetic wave in superconducting media is qualitatively analyzed in view of the effect of an external magnetic field. The velocity and the thickness of the wave front are estimated. It is demonstrated that the inclusion of an external magnetic field affects the thermomagnetic wave profile only slightly.

The evolution of Joule heat during the dissipative motion of a magnetic flux gives rise to pronounced nonlinear effects showing up as various wave processes. These processes define the dynamics of thermal and electromagnetic perturbations in superconducting media [1-3]. The stationary propagation of a nonlinear shock thermomagnetic wave in the resistive state of a superconductor is an example. As is shown [1], the dispersive, nonlinear, and dissipative processes in superconducting media result in the formation of stable thermoelectric,$\vec{E}$, and/or thermomagnetic, $\vec{H}$, waves depending on the surface conditions. It was assumed that the critical current density $\vec{j}_c$ is independent of the local value of the external magnetic field $\vec{H}$ (Bean's model of critical state [4]). However, in sufficiently strong fields, this dependence cannot be disregarded (see, e.g., [5]) and its effect on the nonlinear thermomagnetic wave should be taken into account. In this paper, we studied the structure of a shock thermomagnetic wave for an arbitrary dependence of the critical current density $\vec{j}_c$ on the external magnetic field $\vec{H}$. Expressions for the velocity and the thickness of the wave front were obtained. The propagation of a thermomagnetic wave in a superconducting medium along the x axis with a constant velocity v is described by the nonlinear heat conduction equation (with the self-simulated variables $\xi(x,t) = x - vt$) [1]

$$-\nu v \frac{dT}{d\xi} = \frac{d}{d\xi}\left[\kappa \frac{dT}{d\xi}\right] + jE, \tag{1}$$

Maxwell equations

$$\frac{dE}{d\xi} = -\frac{4\pi v}{c^2} j, \tag{2}$$

$$E = \frac{v}{c} H. \tag{3}$$

and the related equation of critical state

$$\vec{j} = j(T,H) + j_r(E), \tag{4}$$

Here, ν and κ are the specific heat capacity and the thermal, conductivity and j_r is the resistive current density. In the weak heating approximation $(T - T_0) << (T_c - T_0)$, the resistive current density j_r in the range of viscous flow ($E > E_f$); where E_f is the effective field [5]) is a linear function of the vortex electric field; i.e., $j_r \approx \sigma_f E$; where σ_f is the effective conductivity and T_0 and T_c are the equilibrium and the critical superconductor temperatures. For weak fields ($E < E_f$), the dependence $j_r(E)$ is substantially nonlinear and may be attributed to the thermally activated motion of the magnetic flux (flux creep [5]). In the range between two critical magnetic fields $H_{c_1} << H << H_{c_2}$ the dependence of the critical current $j_c(T,H)$ on T and H can be approximated as the product of two functions of single variable:

$$j_c = j_c(T,H) = j_c(T)\Phi(H). \tag{5}$$

Here, $j_c(T) = j_c(T_0) - a(T - T_0)$; $j_c(T_0) = j_0$ is the equilibrium current density, a characterizes the thermal reduction of Abrikosov vortex pinning on crystal defects, and Φ will be determined below for different values of the external field H. The thermal and electrodynamic boundary conditions for Eqs. (1)-(5) are given by

$$\begin{gathered} T(\xi \to +\infty) = T_0, \frac{dT}{d\xi}(\xi \to -\infty) = 0, \\ E(\xi \to +\infty) = 0, E(\xi \to -\infty) = E_e, \end{gathered} \tag{6}$$

where E_e is the constant external electric field.

Jointly solving Eqs. (1)-(5) with boundary conditions (6) yields the following equation for the E wave:

$$\frac{d^2E}{dz^2} + F\left(E, \frac{dE}{dz}\right) + \frac{dU}{dE} = 0 \tag{7}$$

where

$$F = \beta(1+\tau) - \frac{c}{v}\frac{1}{\Phi}\frac{d\Phi}{dE}\left[\beta\tau\frac{j_r(E)}{\sigma_d} + \frac{dE}{dz}\right]\frac{dE}{dz}, \tag{8}$$

$$U = \beta^2\tau\int\limits_0^E \left[1 + \frac{j_0}{j_r}\Phi\right]\frac{j_r}{\sigma_d} - \frac{E^2}{2E_\kappa}\Phi dE. \tag{9}$$

Here $z = \dfrac{\xi}{L}, \tau = \dfrac{4\pi\sigma_f\kappa}{c^2\nu}, \beta = \dfrac{vt_\kappa}{L}, t_\kappa = \dfrac{\nu L^2}{\kappa}, E_\kappa = \dfrac{\kappa}{aL^2}, L = \dfrac{cH_e}{4\pi j_0}$ is the magnetic penetration depth, σ_d is the differential conductivity, and H_e is the external magnetic field.

Following [6], let us represent the equation for stationary points in the phase plane $\left(E, \dfrac{dE}{dz}\right)$ as

$$\beta^2 \tau \frac{j_r}{\sigma_d} \left[1 + \frac{j_0}{j_r} \Phi \right] - \frac{E^2}{2E_\kappa} \Phi = 0. \tag{10}$$

In not-too-strong fields, when $H << H_{c_2}$ the $\Phi \left(\frac{c}{v} E \right)$ function can be chosen in terms of the Kim-Anderson model [7]. In our situation, Eq. (10) has two equilibrium states: a stable node, $E_0 = 0$, and a saddle, $E = E_1$. The phase portrait illustrating these equilibrium states is plotted in Fig. 1. The separatrix AB, connecting these two singular points, corresponds to the "overfall"- type solution with the amplitude E_e. With the boundary conditions $E = E_e$ at $z \to -\infty$, this equation can be written as the equation for wave velocity v_e:

$$1 - \Omega_0 V_E = X_0(v_E) = \Omega_E v_E^2, \tag{11}$$

where

$$\Omega_0 = 2\tau c \frac{t_\kappa^2}{L^2} \frac{E_\kappa}{H_0} [1 - \frac{j_0}{\sigma_d E_e}], \Omega_E = 2\tau \frac{t_\kappa^2}{L^2} \frac{E_\kappa}{E_e}. \tag{12}$$

and H_0 is a constant parameter. Common points of the $X_0(v_E)$ function and the quadratic parabola $\Omega_v E^2$ yield the velocity v_E we are interested in:

$$v_E = \frac{cE_e}{2H_0} \left[1 - \frac{j_0}{\sigma_d E_e} \right] \left[\left(1 + \frac{2L^2}{c^2 t_\kappa^2} E_\kappa \frac{H_0^2}{\tau E_e} \left[1 - \frac{j_0}{\sigma_d E_e} \right]^2 \right)^{1/2} - 1 \right]. \tag{13}$$

The corresponding plot is depicted in Fig. 2. Only the positive value v^+ is physically meaningful. In the limit $H_0 \to \infty$ (Bean's model [4]), the wave velocity is defined by

$$v_E = \frac{L}{t_\kappa} \left[\frac{E_e}{2\tau E_\kappa} \right]^{1/2}. \tag{14}$$

In the reverse case, when $H_0 \to 0$, the velocity is largely small and is almost independent of the wave amplitude E_e:

$$v_E \approx \frac{L^2}{c t_\kappa^2} \frac{H_0^2}{2\tau E_\kappa E_e} \left[1 - \frac{j_0}{\sigma_d E_e} \right]^{-1}. \tag{15}$$

For the field H approaching H_{c_2} the following approximation is valid:

$$v_E \approx c \frac{j_0 E_e}{j_1 H_{c_2}} \left(ln \frac{E_e}{E_0} \right)^{-1}, \tag{16}$$

In conclusion, our results suggest that taking into account an arbitrary dependence of j_c n H has a minor effect on the wave profile, since the phase portrait remains nearly the same. The qualitative analysis presented above may be useful for experimentally studying the penetration of a magnetic flux into a superconductor placed into an external magnetic field. Improving the protection of superconducting devices at the design stage is another possible application of our results.

REFERENCE

1. I. L. Maksimov, Yu. N. Mastakov, and N. A. Tal1anov, Fiz. Tverd. Tela (Leningrad) 28,2323 (1986) [Sov. Phys. Solid State 28, 1300 (1986)].
2. N.A.Taylanov, Superconduc. Science and Technology, 14, 326(2001).
3. N.A.Taylanov., U.T.Yakhshiev. Technical Phys. Lett. (Pis'ma v JTF, Russia) 27, 42(2001).
4. C. P. Bean, Phys. Rev. Lett. 8, 250 (1962).
5. R.G.Mints and A.L.Rakhmanov, Instability in Superconductors (Nauka, Moscow, 1984).
6. V. I. Karpman, Nonlinear Waves in Dispersive Media (Nauka, Moscow, 1973).
7. P. W. Anderson and Y. B. Kim, Rev. Mod. Phys. 36, 36 (1964).